

(j) By **PROF. DR. K. H. VOOUS**

(*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam*)

(Letter dated 23rd October 1956)

With reference to the communication by Dr. Charles Vaurie, "Proposed suppression for nomenclatorial purposes under the Plenary Powers of a pamphlet by R. B. Horniman entitled 'Preliminary descriptions of some new birds' and bearing the date 'January 1940'" in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, I take pleasure in informing you that for the sake of stability in ornithological nomenclature I am supporting the three propositions made by Dr. Vaurie to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on this subject. I much regret that it has apparently not been possible to take up contact with the author, Mr. R. B. Horniman, since it is a very unusual case to suppress so recent a paper without any comment by the author himself or about the scientific standing and activities of the author.

**COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL MADE BY DAVID RIDE ET AL.  
CONCERNING THE HOTTENTOT TEAL**

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 794)

(For the proposal in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 12 : 35-48)

(a) By **V. G. L. van SOMEREN**

(*The Sanctuary, Ngong, Kenya*)

(Letter dated 10th October 1956)

I have just received the above-mentioned paper. The evidence submitted by the applicants is, in my opinion, inconclusive that the type of *Anas punctata* Burchell was in fact *E. maccoa*, although the specimen within the packet bearing the labels quoted is that species.

It can be argued that Burchell must have had a specimen before him when he wrote the description quoted in para. 4, and would suggest the then existence of another specimen, since the description does not, in my opinion, fit any phase in the plumage of *E. maccoa*, either male or female, that I know of.

However, since the applicants state, para. 5, "that the specimen . . . agrees closely with Burchell's description" it would appear necessary for the Commission to examine the specimen in question. The applicants do not state approximate age (adult, subadult, juvenile), or sex of the specimen to account for apparent discrepancy between description and *maccoa* as generally depicted.

If the Commission is satisfied that the description and the specimen do indeed tally, then I would support the application to suppress the name *punctata* Burchell, 1822, as proposed in paragraph 6 on the ground that (a) that the description is not reasonably recognisable as *maccoa*, and indeed has been taken to apply to the Hottentot Teal, (b) by long usage, *punctata* has been applied to and generally accepted as the Hottentot Teal and no other.

(b) By **J. S. TAYLOR**

(*Port Elizabeth, South Africa*)

(Letter dated 26th September 1956)

With reference to the Hottentot Teal, *Anas punctata* Burchell, I am in full agreement with the proposed action.